



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/621,428	07/16/2003	Dieter Heindl	21329-US	8931

22829 7590 10/20/2005

ROCHE MOLECULAR SYSTEMS INC  
PATENT LAW DEPARTMENT  
1145 ATLANTIC AVENUE  
ALAMEDA, CA 94501

EXAMINER

LU, FRANK WEI MIN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1634

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	Application No. 10/621,428	Applicant(s) HEINDL ET AL.	
	Examiner Frank W. Lu	Art Unit 1634	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 30 September 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: 35.  
Claim(s) rejected: 18-23, 32-34 and 36-39.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 15-17 and 24-31.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \_\_\_\_\_  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***ADVISORY ACTION***

1. The proposed amendments filed on September 30, 2005 have been fully considered but will not be entered because they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search.

***Response to Arguments***

I. In page 5, third paragraph of applicant's remarks, applicant argues that the amendments have overcome the objections on claims 23, 35, and 39.

This argument has been fully considered but it is not persuasive toward the withdrawal of the rejection because applicant's argument with respect to claims 23, 35, and 39 is moot since applicant has amended claims 23, 35, and 39. The proposed amendments in claims 23, 35, and 39 raise new issues that would require further consideration.

II. In page 5, last paragraph bridging to page 6, first paragraph of applicant's remarks, applicant argues that the amendments have overcome the rejection on claims 33, 36, 38, and 39 under 35 U.S.C 112, first paragraph.

This argument has been fully considered but it is not persuasive toward the withdrawal of the rejection because applicant's argument with respect to claims 33, 36, 38, and 39 is moot since applicant has amended claims 33, 36, 38, and 39 by canceling claims 33 and 36, and amending claims 38 and 39. The proposed amendments in claims 33, 36, 38, and 39 raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. For example, in the proposed amendments, claims 38 and 39 are not dependent on claim 33 but are dependent on claim 32.

Art Unit: 1634

III. In page 6, second paragraph of applicant's remarks, applicant argues that the amendments have overcome the rejection on claims 34 and 37 under 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph.

This argument has been fully considered but it is not persuasive toward the withdrawal of the rejection because applicant's argument with respect to claims 34 and 47 is moot since applicant has amended claims 34 and 37 by replacing the phrase "second entity" with "nitroindole moiety". The proposed amendments in claims 34 and 37 raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search.

IV. In page 6, third paragraph bridging to page 8, second paragraph of applicant's remarks, applicant argues that the amendments have overcome the rejections on claims 18-23, 32, and 34 under 35 U.S.C 102 and 103.

This argument has been fully considered but it is not persuasive toward the withdrawal of the rejection because applicant's argument with respect to claims 18-23, 32, and 34 is moot since applicant has amended claims 18-22 and 32. The proposed amendments in claims 18-22 and 32 raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. For example, now amended claims 18-22 and 32 are directed to kit claims and a first oligonucleotide and a second oligonucleotide in the amended claims 20 and 32 now are single stranded oligonucleotide.

2. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Group 1600 via the PTO Fax Center. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993), and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993)(See 37 CAR § 1.6(d)). The CM Fax Center number is (571) 273-8300.

Art Unit: 1634

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frank Lu, Ph.D., whose telephone number is 571-272-0746. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9 A.M. to 5 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, W. Gary Jones, can be reached on (571) 272-0745.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Chemical Matrix receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Frank Lu  
PSA  
October 12, 2005

KENNETH R. HORLICK, PH.D.  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

*Kenneth R. Horlick*

10/13/05